

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 4, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 25, 30, and 35 have been amended, and claims 12 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 1-27 and 29-35 are currently pending.

The Examiner objected to claim 12 as being of improper dependent form and claims 30 and 34-35 for informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 14, 17-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,443,470). Claims 24-25, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pyun (U.S. Patent No. 6,274,977). Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Pyun. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Hu (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,270). Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Pyun. Claims 20 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyun in view of Watanabe. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyun in view of Kang (U.S. Patent No. 6,806,636). Claims 1, 4-6, and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Kang. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Kang and further in view of Pyun. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Kang and Hu.

The objection to claim 12 is now moot as claim 12 has been canceled. Claim 30 and 35 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections to claims 30 and 34-35.

The rejection of claims 14, 17-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 14 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the panel satisfies the following condition $1.1 \leq (R_{xs}/R_{yc}) \leq 4.6$ ". Watanabe does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner states that Watanabe teaches $R_{xs}/R_{ys} = 1.1$. (See column 14, lines 53-65.) In reality Watanabe teaches $R_{il}/R_{iy} = R_{xs}/R_{ys} = 1984/1870 = 1.061$. Therefore Watanabe teaches a value for R_{xs}/R_{ys} outside the claimed range of 1.1 to 4.6. Accordingly claim 14 and claims 17-19 and 21-23, which depend from claim 14, are allowable over Watanabe. Further, claims 15-16 and 20 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 14 because Pyun or Hu, singly or in combination with Watanabe, do not cure the deficiencies of Watanabe.

The rejection of claims 24-25, 29, and 32 under U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 24 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein the panel satisfies the following condition $0.22 \cdot Z_d \leq Z(d/2) \leq 0.26 \cdot Z_d$, wherein $Z(d/2)$ is height difference between a point on the inner surface of the panel at the central point and a point on the inner surface of the panel half way between the central point and the corner of the effective area of the panel”. Pyun does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 28, which has been canceled. The Examiner states regarding claim 28 that:

Regarding claims 26-28, Pyun does not give specific values for the $Z(y/2)$, $Z(x/2)$, and $Z(d/2)$. However, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide optimum ranges for the $Z(y/2)$, $Z(x/2)$, and $Z(d/2)$, since optimization of workable ranges is considered with the skill of the art.

Watanabe does not teach anywhere the values $Z(y/2)$, $Z(x/2)$, and $Z(d/2)$. Therefore, the general conditions of the claim are not disclosed in Watanabe as claimed in the rejection, so it could not have been obvious to provide optimum ranges for parameters that were not disclosed or contemplated in Watanabe. Accordingly claim 24 and claims 25, 29, and 32, which depend from claim 4, are allowable over Watanabe. Further, claims 26-27, 30-31, and 33-35 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 24 because Pyun or Kang, singly or in combination with Watanabe, do not cure the deficiencies of Watanabe.

The present invention is assigned to LG Electronics Inc., which assignment is recorded at reel 14582, frame 495. Kang is also assigned to LG Electronics Inc., which assignment is recorded at reel 12824, frame 626. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Kang cannot be applied as prior art against claims 1-11 and 13. Therefore, as the Examiner admits that Watanabe by itself is insufficient to reject claims 1-11 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 and 13 are allowable over the cited art.


Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No.: 40,106
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant